

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-32 are pending in the application and that claims 1-32 stand rejected. By this response, claim 16 is amended to correct for informalities pointed out by the Examiner and not in response to prior art. All other claims continue un-amended by this response.

In view of the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of these claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Objections

A. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

Reference numbers 100, 300 and 500 mentioned in the specification are missing in FIG. 1, FIG. 3A and FIG. 5, respectively.

In response, the Applicant has amended Figures 1, 3A and 5 to include the reference numbers 100, 300 and 500, respectively, as required by the Examiner.

Having made these changes, the Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for the Examiner's objection to the Applicant's drawings has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Rejections

A. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. More specifically, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-32 comprise the limitations as of "receiving voice traffic at a VoIP gateway" and "multiplexing said voice traffic at the said VoIP gateway" and that the specification and drawings only disclose the steps of "determine whether a destination is serviced by a second VoIP Gateway". The Examiner alleges that the specification and drawings fail to disclose the steps and data structure of "receiving voice traffic at the said VoIP gateway". The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Applicant absolutely teaches and discloses, throughout the Specification, the step of "receiving voice traffic at said VoIP gateway" as claimed by at least the Applicant's independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 27. More specifically, the Applicant, in the Specification, specifically recites:

"A method of transporting voice traffic from a Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) gateway, over an Internet Protocol (IP) network, to a destination, according to the present invention comprises the steps of: **receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway**, determining whether the destination is serviced by a second VoIP gateway; multiplexing the voice traffic at the VoIP gateway; and transporting the multiplexed voice traffic to the second VoIP gateway utilizing a plurality of transport packets, responsive to an affirmative determination that the destination is serviced by the second VoIP gateway." (See Summary, page 2, lines 10-16). (emphasis added).

In the Summary of the invention, the Applicant specifically discloses that a method of the present invention includes the step of "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway" as claimed in the Applicant's independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 27. Furthermore, the Applicant also describes a method of the present invention which includes the step of "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway" as claimed by the Applicant. More specifically, the Applicant in the Specification specifically recites:

"The method 300 is initiated at step 302 and proceeds to step 304, where the first VoIP gateway 122 receives a request from a source to connect to a respective destination. It should be noted that the first VoIP gateway may also receive multiple requests from multiple sources for connections to multiple destinations. (See Specification, page 6, lines 18-21).

In support of and to teach the step of "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway", the Applicant, in the specification, teaches a configuration in which a first VoIP gateway is connected to at least one source of voice traffic. The Applicant, in the Specification, specifically recites:

"Specifically, the system of FIG. 1 comprises a first VoIP gateway 122 which is coupled to a telephone 102 via a transmission medium 110 (illustratively, a copper pair, coaxial cable, fiber optic cable or the like), a first Voice over Digital Subscriber Service Line (VoDSL) Integrated Access Device (IAD) 112 via a transmission medium 114, a cable modem 116 via a transmission medium 118, and a first cell site 120 via a transmission medium 121. First VoDSL IAD 112 is in turn coupled to a terminal 104 (illustratively, a telephone, a Personal Computer(PC) or workstation). A terminal 106 is coupled to cable modem 116. A cellular phone 108 is coupled to first cell site 120 via a radio frequency link." (See Specification, page 3, lines 21 to 28).

Having described a configuration wherein a VoIP gateway is able to receive voice traffic from at least one source, the Applicant further teaches "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway" by specifically reciting:

"As a call arrives at the first VoIP gateway 122 from, for example a DSL subscriber, first VoIP gateway 122 compares the phone number of the called party to a database which has a corresponding IP address for a VoIP gateway (e.g. VoIP gateway 128) that serves the called party. After a determination is made that the second VoIP gateway exists and is compatible, via signaling messages communicated between the respective gateways another determination is made by the first VoIP gateway 122 whether traffic is being presently provided to the second VoIP gateway 128. If traffic is currently being provided to the second VoIP gateway 128, voice traffic from the recent call is encapsulated with a modified Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) which will be discussed more fully in FIG. 3." (See Specification, page 4, lines 21-29).

The Applicant specifically teaches that a first VoIP receives a call from a voice traffic source and compares the phone number of the called party to a database which has a corresponding IP address for a second VoIP that serves the called party. More specifically, the first VoIP receives data from a voice traffic source, the data including at least the telephone number of an intended, called party, and compares the received telephone number to a database to determine the IP address of a second VoIP that serves the called party.

Even further, the Applicant teaches a specific method and protocol for "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway" as claimed by the Applicant's independent claims. More specifically, the Applicant in the Specification specifically recites:

"In the call flow diagram of FIG. 6, the signaling for the call setup and disconnect among first VoIP gateway 122, gatekeeper 124 and second VoIP gateway 128 is defined in the International Telecommunication Union – Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) Recommendation H.225, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety. Control operations as well as capabilities exchange is defined in the International Telecommunication Union – Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) Recommendation H.245, which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

H.225 signaling begins with party A initiating an Internet call by picking up telephone 102 and dialing party B's telephone number which is also known as an E.164 address. At step 602 the first VoIP gateway 122 communicates a Location Request (LRQ) message to gatekeeper 124 seeking the transport address of the second VoIP gateway 128 serving party B's telephone number. Gatekeeper 124 retrieves a table which contains transport addresses for corresponding telephone numbers." (See Specification, page 9, line 23 through page 10, line 6).

In the Specification, the Applicant teaches a specific protocol to be used in an embodiment of the Applicant's invention for "receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway" as claimed in at least the Applicant's independent claims. More specifically, the Applicant specifically teaches that in one embodiment of the present invention the signaling for the call setup and disconnect among the first VoIP gateway, a gatekeeper and a second VoIP gateway is defined in the

International Telecommunication Union – Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) Recommendation H.225. The Applicant further incorporates the teachings of the (ITU-T) Recommendation H.225 into the Specification by reference in its entirety.

In further support of the limitation of “receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway” as claimed by the Applicant’s independent claims, the Applicant teaches specific structure in a claimed VoIP for performing the “receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway” as claimed by the Applicant’s independent claims.

More specifically, the Applicant in the Specification specifically recites:

“Specifically, FIG. 2 depicts a high level block diagram of a VoIP gateway 122 suitable for use in the communication system 100 of FIG. 1. The VoIP gateway controller 122C comprises a microprocessor 220 as well as memory 230 for storing programs 250 such as VoIP processing method 300 which will be described more fully below in a discussion of FIG. 3. The microprocessor 220 cooperates with conventional support circuitry 240 such as power supplies, clock circuits, cache memory and the like as well as circuits that assist in executing the software methods of the present invention. As such, it is contemplated that some of the process steps discussed herein as software processes may be implemented with hardware, for example, a circuitry that cooperates with the microprocessor 220 to form various steps.

The VoIP gateway controller 122C also comprises input/output circuitry 210 that forms an interface between the microprocessor 220, the IP network 126, telephone 102, VoDSL IAD 112, cable RG 116, cell site 120, and other VoIP circuitry (not shown).” (See Specification, page 5, line 21 through page 6, line 5).

The Applicant in the Specification specifically teaches an embodiment of a VoIP gateway. The VoIP gateway of the Applicant’s invention comprises at least a microprocessor, which cooperates with conventional support circuitry such as power supplies, clock circuits, cache memory and the like for executing the software methods of the present invention. The embodiment of the VoIP further comprises a memory for storing programs such as VoIP processing methods. In direct support of the limitation of “receiving voice traffic at the VoIP gateway” as claimed by the Applicant’s independent claims, the Applicant in the Specification

further teaches that the VoIP comprises input/output circuitry that forms an interface between at least the microprocessor and the voice traffic sources. That is, the Applicant specifically teaches that the VoIP of the present invention, at least in one embodiment, receives the voice traffic from voice traffic sources via input/output circuitry.

As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation of “receiving voice traffic at the said VoIP gateway” as claimed by the Applicant’s claims is taught throughout the Applicant’s Specification, and specifically in at least the portions of the Applicant’s Specification recited above.

As such, and for at least the reasons recited above, the Applicant respectfully submits that that claims 1-32, and specifically the limitation of “receiving voice traffic at the said VoIP gateway”, are fully supported by and described throughout the Applicants’ specification. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-32, as they now stand, fully comply with the written description requirement and hence fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, as not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. The Examiner alleges that claim 16 recites the limitation “..., wherein said UDP/IP packets transport at least one modified Real-time Transport Protocol (RTP) packet” and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In response, the Applicant has amended claim 16 to depend from dependent claim 15 which provides antecedent basis for UDP/IP packets.

Having made this change, the Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for the Examiner’s rejection of claim 16 has been removed and that the Applicant’s claim 16 now complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112

second paragraph. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Thus the Applicant respectfully submits that all of these claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Jorge Tony Villabon at (732) 530-9404 x1131 or Mr. Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Eamon J. Wall
Reg. No. 39,414
(732) 530-9404

Dated: 8/25/04

CUSTOMER #26,291
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
732-530-9404 - Telephone
732-530-9808 - Facsimile